IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

DWAYNE E. CROPPER,

Defendant Below,
Appellant,

V.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Plaintiff Below,
Appellee.

SHOW AND SERVICE STATE OF DELAWARE,
Plaintiff Below,
Appellee.

SHOW AND SERVICE S

Submitted: October 4, 2021 Decided: October 25, 2021

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **TRAYNOR** and **MONTGOMERY-REEVES**, Justices.

<u>ORDER</u>

After consideration of the notice to show cause and the appellant's response, it appears to the Court that:

- (1) On September 20, 2021, the appellant, Dwayne E. Cropper, filed this appeal from a Superior Court order dated August 3, 2021, and docketed on August 4, 2021, that denied his "Motion for Writ." Under Supreme Court Rules 6 and 11, a timely notice of appeal should have been filed on or before September 3, 2021.
- (2) The Senior Court Clerk issued a notice directing Cropper to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed as untimely filed. On September 27, 2021, the Court received the certified-mail receipt, confirming that the notice to show

cause had been delivered. A response to the notice to show cause was therefore due on or before October 7, 2021. On October 4 and 5, 2021, Cropper filed an official Form A Notice of Appeal, a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a "Memorandum [in] Support of Writ." In the memorandum, Cropper asserts various challenges to his conviction, such as ineffective assistance of counsel, an allegation that the Superior Court docket has been falsified, and a claim that the State failed to provide him with favorable evidence; none of the documents that he filed address the untimeliness of his appeal.

(3) A notice of appeal must be timely filed to invoke the Court's appellate jurisdiction.¹ A notice of appeal must be received by the Court within the applicable time period to be effective.² Unless an appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, an untimely appeal cannot be considered.³ The failure to file a timely appeal in this case is not attributable to court-related personnel. Therefore, the appeal must be dismissed.

_

¹ Carr v. State, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del. 1989).

² Del. Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

³ Bey v. State, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, under Supreme Court Rule 29(b), that the appeal is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Tamika R. Montgomery-Reeves
Justice